Quantum Speed Limit and Optimal Control of Many-Boson Dynamics

Ioannis Brouzos,[1] Alexej I. Streltsov,[2] Antonio Negretti,[3] Ressa S. Said,[1] Tommaso Caneva,[4] Simone Montangero,[1] and Tommaso Calarco[1]

[1] *Center for Integrated Quantum Science and Technology, Institute for Complex Quantum Systems, Universität Ulm, D-89069 Ulm, Germany*
[2] *Theoretische Chemie, Physikalisch-Chemisches Institut, Universität Heidelberg, D-69120 Heidelberg, Germany*
[3] *Zentrum für Optische Quantentechnologien and The Hamburg Centre for Ultrafast Imaging, Universität Hamburg, Luruper Chaussee 149, D-22761 Hamburg, Germany*
[4] *ICFO-Institut de Ciencies Fotoniques, Mediterranean Technology Park, S-08860 Castelldefels (Barcelona), Spain*

(Dated: May 13, 2015)

We extend the concept of quantum speed limit – the minimal time needed to perform a driven evolution – to complex interacting many-body systems. We investigate a prototypical many-body system, a bosonic Josephson junction, at increasing levels of complexity: (a) within the two-mode approximation corresponding to a nonlinear two-level system, (b) at the mean-field level by solving the nonlinear Gross-Pitaevskii equation in a double well potential, and (c) at an exact many-body level by solving the time-dependent many-body Schrödinger equation. We propose a control protocol to transfer atoms from the ground state of a well to the ground state of the neighbouring well. Furthermore, we show that the detrimental effects of the inter-particle repulsion can be eliminated by means of a compensating control pulse, yielding, quite surprisingly, an enhancement of the transfer speed because of the particle interaction – in contrast to the self-trapping scenario. Finally, we perform numerical optimisations of both the nonlinear and the (exact) many-body quantum dynamics in order to further enhance the transfer efficiency close to the quantum speed limit.

PACS numbers: 02.30.Yy, 03.75.Kk, 03.75.Lm, 05.60.Gg

arXiv:1412.6142v2 [quant-ph] 12 May 2015

The maximum speed of evolution of a quantum system has been a subject of theoretical investigation since decades. This research activity – mainly focused on state-to-state transfer for single-particle quantum dynamics – resulted in the introduction of the concept generally known as quantum speed limit (QSL), namely the minimum time needed to achieve a certain quantum state transformation [1, 2]. In the last few years, this fascinating theoretical concept, which arises from an energy-time uncertainty relation, has started to have practical relevance especially for the development of quantum technologies and because quantum gas laboratories are now capable of probing it [3, 4]. Indeed, recent experiments with cold atoms on a chip reported the achievement of time-optimal processes at the QSL [4]. However, the QSL for nonlinear and many-body quantum systems has not been clearly defined yet and, in particular, the influence of the inter-particle interaction on the QSL has to be still clarified. Here, we provide an exhaustive theoretical analysis on this subject and we apply it to the relevant scenario of ultracold bosons in a double well that has been realized [5, 6] and controlled [7] experimentally. We characterize the QSL of nonlinear and many-body systems of bosons, and show that optimal control might be effectively applied to achieve time-optimal transformations. In particular, we show that optimal control strategies can be developed to cancel the decelerating effects of the repulsive atom interactions. These strategies differ substantially in the vicinity of the QSL in such a way that the combination of an exact many-body quantum description and optimal control is instrumental in order to achieve the best performance. Our optimal control schemes are characterized by simplicity of the pulses and feasibility of their application in all experiments dealing with linear or nonlinear two-level systems. They contribute to solving key problems of the atom transfer by compensating self-trapping and damping of the oscillations in a time-optimal manner, and achieve complete control of the motion on the Bloch sphere which facilitates interferometric protocols.

In our study different degrees of complexity in the description of the system are gradually considered (see Fig. 1). (a) We analyse the optimal dynamics for a Bosonic Josephson Junction (BJJ) [8, 9] within the two-mode approximation, where one mode (i.e., orbital) per well, solution of the time-independent Gross-Pitaevskii Equation (GPE), is assumed [10]. (b) We investigate the mean-field scenario for which the time-dependent GPE dynamics in the double well potential in coordinate space is solved, and finally (c) we solve the full many-body Schrödinger equation by means of the ab initio Multi-Configurational Time-Dependent Hartree method for Bosons (MCTDHB) [11]. The latter approach allows us to include possible excitations to higher orbitals (i.e., beyond the GPE), which are responsible for quantum depletion and fragmentation.

In a linear two-level system the magnitude of the coupling J between the two levels characterizes the QSL of a state-to-state transfer. Hence, the minimum time for the transfer between two orthogonal states is given by half the Rabi period, that is, $T^L_{QSL} = \pi\hbar/2J$ [1, 2]. Such time-optimal dynamics occurs along a geodesic on the Bloch

sphere connecting the initial and the target state [see Fig. 1(d)]. Our main goal is to extend the geodesic interpretation of the QSL to interacting bosonic many-body quantum systems. At the beginning we show that at the level of the two-mode BJJ model, which in the presence of inter-particle interactions becomes nonlinear [12], the time-optimal dynamics does follow a geodesic too. This can be achieved by canceling the deviations from the geodesic path, due to the nonlinear interaction, by means of analytically computable Compensating Control Pulses (CCP). We then study the range of validity of this strategy in a double well configuration in coordinate space where the two-mode and GPE approximations may not hold anymore. We show that the CCP performs very well even close to the QSL if fragmentation, a genuine many-body effect, is neglected. We find, quite surprisingly, that for strong interactions – when the uncontrolled dynamics experience the self-trapping – the CCP leads to even faster speeds of the full transfer, taking efficiently advantage of the increase in the effective tunneling coupling. Finally we show that, when large deviations from the ideal transfer efficiency close to QSL occur, they are corrected by means of optimal control by applying the Chopped RAndom Basis (CRAB) algorithm [13].

QSL of a BJJ. The dynamics of the most general scenario of a quantum optimal control problem is described by the Hamiltonian $H(t) = H_d + \sum_i c_i(t)H_i$, where H_d represents the time-independentpart of the dynamics (drift), and H_i are the control parts with control pulses $c_i(t)$. Here we focus on the task of optimizing the transfer from an initial state $|\psi_0\rangle$ to a target state $|\psi_T\rangle$. Optimal control looks for an optimal time dependence of the control pulses $c_i(t)$ such that a given figure of merit is minimized [14]. For the latter we use the infidelity $\varepsilon = 1 - F^2$, where $F(\rho_T, \rho) = \mathrm{Tr}\left[\sqrt{\sqrt{\rho_T}\rho\sqrt{\rho_T}}\right]$ is the Uhlmann fidelity which measures the overlap of the two density matrices ρ_T and ρ [15] and vanishes when the transfer to the target state is complete. The typical questions that arise in optimal control are threefold: (i) is a complete transfer possible ($\varepsilon = 0$)? (ii) If so, what is the minimum time (i.e., the quantum speed limit) to achieve it? (iii) What are the optimal control pulses $c_i(t)$ that minimize the infidelity, the transfer time, or both? The answers to these questions depend on the specific quantum system [7, 16, 17]. Recently formal expressions have been derived to compute the QSL for a general Liouvillian evolution [18, 19].

The Hamiltonian of a linear two-level system reads: $H_L(t) = -\hbar J\sigma_x + \hbar D(t)\sigma_z$, where the drift term expresses the coupling strength J between the two levels and $D(t)$ is the (controllable) detuning. A prototypical process that can be driven in such a system is a state-to-state transfer [3, 7, 16]. In Fig. 1 we represent the quantum state $|\psi(t)\rangle = e^{i\alpha(t)}\{\cos[\theta(t)/2]|\psi_0\rangle + \sin[\theta(t)/2]e^{i\phi(t)}|\psi_T\rangle\}$ on a Bloch sphere. The speed of a quantum state moving in the Hilbert space is: $\dot{s}(t) = 2\Delta H(t)/\hbar$, where $\Delta H(t) = \sqrt{\langle H^2(t)\rangle - \langle H(t)\rangle^2}$, and s is the geodesic distance between two states $|\psi\rangle$,$|\chi\rangle$, defined as $|\langle\chi|\psi\rangle|^2 = \cos^2(s/2)$ [20]. In a two-level system, the speed $\dot{s}(t) = \sqrt{\dot{\theta}(t)^2 + \sin^2\theta(t)\dot{\phi}(t)^2}$ has two components: $\dot{\theta}(t) = J\sin\phi(t)$, which drives the state along the meridians of the Bloch sphere, and $\dot{\phi}(t) = D(t) + J\cot\theta(t)\cos\phi(t)$ along the parallels. In order to reach the time-optimal transfer between north and south pole of the Bloch sphere (see also Fig. 1), only the speed term $\dot{\theta}(t)$ should be maximized: that is, $\dot{\theta} = J$ at $\phi(t) = \pm\pi/2$, which implies $D(t) = 0$. Therefore the pulse given by the condition $D(t) = 0$ minimizes the infidelity (i.e., $\varepsilon \to 0$), the transfer time T^L_{QSL}, and the path length $S = \int \dot{s}\, dt = \pi$ following the geodesic ($\phi(t)$ is constant). In case constraints are present on the control pulse, e.g. certain initial and final values of the detuning are assumed and can not be changed instantaneously,



FIG. 1. (a)-(c) The dynamics of the bosonic Josephson junction is studied at various levels of complexity and approximations. (d) Bloch Sphere representation of different paths for the two-mode nonlinear dynamics for $UN/2J = 1$: uncontrolled GPE (red), CCP (green), and CRAB-optimized with constraints on the pulse $D(0) = -D(T) = 2J$ (blue). The path with black asterisks represents a geodesic. Upper and lower sketches: Initial and target states in the double-well potential (black line) for strong (magenta) and weak (cyan) interaction strength. Left and right sketches: controlled and uncontrolled wave functions and trap potentials.

the optimal strategy is still the one that fulfils as much as possible the condition $|D| = 0$, as shown numerically in Ref. [16] and experimentally in Ref. [3]. We have assumed that J is time-independent, since, if J can be varied, the time optimal solution is trivially the one that maximizes its value, and consequently minimizes T^L_{QSL}.

Everything we have discussed so far applies to time-dependent or time-independent, linear or nonlinear Hamiltonians, provided that the coupling term J is ϕ-independent. For instance, the BJJ Hamiltonian has an additional term with respect to the linear case H_L: $H_{BJJ} = H_L + \hbar[U + \Delta U \cos\theta(t)]\mathbb{I} + \hbar[\Delta U + U\cos\theta(t)]\sigma_z$, where U is the nonlinear interaction strength and ΔU the interaction detuning between the two modes (see Supplemental Material for details) [10]. The nonlinear terms affect the speed on the parallels so that in the corresponding equation of motion $D(t)$ has to be replaced by $\Delta(t) = D(t) + \Delta U + U\cos\theta(t)$. Now even for $D(t) = 0$ there is a non zero speed component that drives the state out of the geodesic path ($U \neq 0$ implies $\dot{\phi} \neq 0$), as shown by the trajectory depicted in Fig. 1 (red line).

Now, in order to recover the time-optimal trajectory on a geodesic (green line) we impose the condition $\Delta(t) = 0$ which here translates to [21]:

$$D(t) = -\Delta U - U\cos\theta(t). \tag{1}$$

Finding the solution of this equation appears not trivial since it is a nonlinear problem: $\cos\theta(t)$ depends on the parameters of the problem ($D(t)$, U, ΔU) and the time evolution of $\phi(t)$ itself. However, from the solution of the linear case, we know that if $\Delta(t) = 0$ the system will move on a geodesic with maximum speed in a Rabi oscillation, i.e. $\cos\theta(t) = \cos^2(Jt)$. In the following we will refer to this pulse as compensating control pulse (CCP) and investigate numerically its effectiveness and robustness.

Let us highlight that the CCP technique has various advantages for all experiments that work in the two-mode framework: (a) It has a simple form that makes it applicable in experimental setups from Landau-Zenner transitions [3] to double-well [5–7] and internal BJJ [22] dynamics. (b) It addresses the particularly difficult problem of such experiments, the motion on the meridians of the Bloch sphere, by overcoming the self-trapping mechanism. Therefore it allows to reach any point on the Bloch sphere (also non-orthogonal to the initial one) at minimum time, since any phase-shift (motion on ϕ) is easily achievable by setting an arbtrarily large detuning $D(t)$ or decoupling the modes. To the extent that there is no constraint in $D(t)$ (an assumption valid also in [3] and [16]) the time needed for this phase shift can be made arbitrarily small. (c) Our technique can nearly solve the problem of damping of the BJJ dynamics from which some experiments suffer [6, 23] by setting the term which is responsible for it ($\dot{\phi}$) to zero [24]. (d) It is finally a general concept on how to keep the phase constant and change only the imbalance of population, which can be



FIG. 2. Dynamics in a double-well: (a) Infidelity ε as a function of the transfer time T for representative values of the interaction strength Ng (weak $Ng = 0.2$ and strong $Ng = 0.5$) for uncontrolled dynamics (red symbols and curves) and for the CCP (green symbols) with fitting on a geodesic Rabi-oscillation behavior (green curves). For solving the dynamics two methods have been used: GPE and MCTDHB. Black curve and asterisk symbols correspond to the non-interacting uncontrolled dynamics on the geodesic. The shadowed area in the lower righthand corner highlights the region close to T_{QSL} (see also Fig. 3). Inset: QSL time, T^{NL}_{QSL}, as a function of the nonlinear interaction strength Ng compared to the non-interacting (linear) case T^L_{QSL}.

of a great help for reading, mapping and other features of interferometry processes [23]

Numerical results. We have verified numerically, within the two-mode approximation, that the CCP drives the system along a geodesic, efficiently canceling the nonlinear interactions, and therefore achieving the full transfer at T_{QSL}, as it is also shown in Fig. 1 (green path). If there are constraints on the pulse, e.g. boundary conditions on the initial an final values of $D(t)$, then the condition of Eq. (1) cannot be fulfilled at every time, as required by the CCP scheme. Nevertheless, one could then devise an optimal control pulse by means of numerical optimisation. A typical result is reported in Fig. 1 (blue path) which has been obtained by using the CRAB algorithm. Note that the dynamics generated by the constrained optimal control pulse approximately follows a trajectory similar to the one induced by the CCP, namely moving at any time as close as possible to a geodesic.

We now go beyond the two-mode approximation by applying the previous findings to a Bose-Einstein condensate (BEC) in a one-dimensional double-well potential, the most common experimental realization of an atomic BJJ [5–7]. In those setups it is possible to vary in time the tilt of the double well, which corresponds to controlling $D(t)$ in the two-mode model. Our goal is to obtain a complete transfer of the BEC, initially prepared in the left well of the double well potential, to the right

well. In particular, we consider a system composed by $N = 100$ interacting bosons trapped in a double well consisting of two separated harmonic traps of equal frequency ω and length $\ell = \sqrt{\hbar/(m\omega)}$ [25] (see Fig. 1 and the Supplemental Material technical details). We have then applied the different control schemes introduced before (CCP/CRAB), for various interaction strengths Ng, transfer times T, and approaches to solve the many-body quantum dynamics (GPE/MCTDHB).

To begin with, we consider the GPE dynamics and in Fig. 2 we compare the infidelity for a symmetric (unbiased) double well potential (red curves) within the scenario where the CCP on the tilt has been applied (green curves), as a function of the transfer time T as well as for various interaction strengths Ng. The time-independent scenario confirms the standard BJJ theory, which predicts a Rabi oscillation (on the geodesic) for vanishing interaction strength (black line), a full but delayed transfer for weak interactions $Ng = 0.2(\hbar\omega\ell)^{-1}$, and a nonlinear self-trapping regime, where less than half of the atoms are transferred to the right well, for strong interaction strengths $Ng = 0.5(\hbar\omega\ell)^{-1}$ (see also Supplemental Material). The situation changes drastically when we apply the CCP: for all cases the infidelity follows a $\cos^2(JT)$ behavior as all the fitting green lines in Fig. 2 show. These results demonstrate that the CCP drives the system along the geodesic, resulting in a successful time-optimal transfer within the GPE dynamics, for all values of Ng. Moreover, the CCP not only compensates the nonlinearity recovering the linear single-particle dynamics (black line in Fig. 2), but it increases the speed of the transfer as demonstrated in the inset of Fig. 2: a decrease of the T_{QSL} for larger nonlinearities is reported there. This is indeed surprising, since it contrasts with the usual situation where repulsive interactions slow down the tunneling, and even completely prevent it in the case of strong nonlinear self-trapping (see red lines in Fig. 2). On the other hand, in a two-mode intuitive picture, the repulsion leads to a broadening of the initial and target wave-functions, which increases their overlap, and thus their tunnel coupling J (see sketches of Fig. 1 and Supplemental Material). As a consequence, the speed enhancement of the tunneling transfer is obtained by the control pulses that cancel the delaying and self-trapping effects of the repulsion and exploit its positive effects.

Figure 3(a) reports the same results, but it focuses on the challenging time regime close to T_{QSL}, where the deviations from the two-mode approximation become significant. We note, however, that the CCPs still achieve quite small values of the infidelity (green symbols), although they do not reach the expected values corresponding to a perfect geodesic trajectory (green curves). We then resort to CRAB optimizations, which correct these discrepancies and produce optimal control pulses that result in values of ε much closer to the curve (blue symbols). We thus conclude that the geodesic behavior obtained by



FIG. 3. Focus on the QSL region: Infidelities in log scale, for (a) GPE and (b) MCTDHB results (with same symbols as in Fig. 2) of CCP pulses (green symbols), and CRAB optimizations (blue symbols). Inset: Representative optimal control pulses for the tilt of the double-well near the QSL.

the CCP (with possibly an additional optimization) enables time-optimal GPE dynamics in a double-well.

Up to now, we have investigated the dynamics of the bosons in the framework of mean field GPE theory. For small particle numbers such description might become inadequate, and in the limit of large repulsion between the bosons fails completely. Thus we investigate the driven dynamics of the bosons also by means of the MCTDHB method, which enables us to solve the many-body Schrödinger equation exactly, up to a target numerical accuracy that can be set a priori. In Ref. [25] it has been shown in a similar time-independent BJJ double-well potential, that deviations from the GPE predictions for all time scales, and especially for strong interactions, might occur. Indeed, deviations induced by many-body fragmentation and depletion depend on several factors: number of atoms, interaction strength, dimensionality, total time evolution, strength of the control driving, potential profile. In Fig. 2 one can clearly see that the undriven dynamics calculated with MCTDHB (red cross and plus symbols) do not have significant deviations from the red curves obtained via GPE. However, when we apply the CCP, MCTDHB (green cross and plus symbols) and the GPE dynamics agree only for short time scales, while close to the QSL [see also Fig. 3(b)] and for strong interaction strengths there is a substantial disagreement (of

up to one order of magnitude). This discrepancy occurs as for long times, strong driving, and strong couplings the fragmentation becomes not negligible (depletion of the condensate orbital of the order of 10%). Hence, for these particular situations we need to rely on optimal control in order to further improve the transfer efficiency. To this aim, we applied the CRAB optimization to the MCTDHB simulation for transfer times in the vicinity of the QSL. We succeeded to reduce the infidelities from $\varepsilon \approx 10\%$ to $\varepsilon \approx 1\%$ (see Fig. 3(b) blue points). In the inset of Fig. 3(b) we present representative optimal pulses for the tilt of the double well close to the QSL. As it is shown, there is a large difference between CRAB optimizations performed with the GPE or exact many-body MCTDHB simulations.

In conclusion we have shown that the repulsive interaction between the particles is responsible for slowing down the dynamics of a bosonic Josephson junction, and also precludes a highly efficient state transfer. We have provided the conditions to design a compensating control pulse that eliminates the detrimental effects of the interaction and drive the system on a geodesic path at the quantum speed limit. Our driving scheme allows for an increase of the transfer speed for stronger interaction strengths as it exploits the constructive effects of the interaction. Close to the QSL and for large interaction strengths, the mean field description does not accurately account for the dynamics, and a simple compensating control pulse strategy is not sufficient to achieve high transfer efficiency. Given this, we have to resort to optimal control of the many-body Schrödinger equation, which can be efficiently solved by the ab-initio MCTDHB method. Our study introduced the concepts to characterize the QSL for many-body systems at all levels of complexity of the description of the problem (two-mode, nonlinear mean-field, full many-body), and provided optimal control schemes to achieve the state-to-state transfer at minimum time. Our control pulses are simple, feasible and easily applicable to a variety of linear nonlinear and many-body systems in the laboratory, and it can provide a time-optimal solution to common issues like self-trapping and damping of oscillations, which limit the experimental possibilities of atom transfer and interferometry.

Acknowledgements. We acknowledge the support of the EU funded FET project QUIBEC, SIQS, QUAINT (GA N^{o} 297861), the German Research Foundation (DFG) via the SFB/TRR21, and the excellence cluster Hamburg CUI of the Forschungsgemeinschaft, the computational time within BwGrid and HLRS computational facilities and DFG grant number CE-10/52-1. We thank the group of Jörg Schmiedmayer for inspiring discussions.

[1] P. Pfeifer, Phys. Rev. Lett. **70**, 3365 (1993); K. Bhattacharyya, J. Phys. A: Math. Gen. **16**, 2993 (1983).
[2] N. Margolus and L.B. Levitin, Physica D **120**, 188(1998); V. Giovannetti, S. Lloyd, and L. Maccone, Phys. Rev. A **67** , 052109 (2003); L.B. Levitin and T. Toffoli, Phys. Rev. Lett. **103** 160502 (2009).
[3] M.G. Bason *et al.*, Nat. Phys. **8**, 147-152 (2012)
[4] S. van Frank *et al.*, Nat. Commun. **5**, 4009 (2014).
[5] M. Albiez *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **95**, 010402 (2005).
[6] T. Betz *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **106**, 020407 (2011).
[7] Y.-A. Chen *et al.*, Nat. Phys. **7**, 61 (2011).
[8] U. Hohenester *et al.*, Phys. Rev. A **75**, 023602 (2007); J. Grond, J. Schmiedmayer, and U. Hohenester, Physica E **42** 432 (2010).
[9] M. Lapert, G. Ferrini, and D. Sugny, Phys. Rev. A **85**, 023611 (2012).
[10] S. Raghavan *et al.*, Phys. Rev. A **59**, 620 (1999); G.J. Milburn *et al.*, Phys. Rev. A **55**, 4318 (1997).
[11] A. I. Streltsov, O. E. Alon, and L. S. Cederbaum, Phys. Rev. Lett. **99**, 030402 (2007); O. E. Alon, A. I. Streltsov, and L. S. Cederbaum, Phys. Rev. A **77**, 033613 (2008); A. U. J. Lode, K. Sakmann, O. E. Alon, L. S. Cederbaum, and A. I. Streltsov, Phys. Rev. A **86**, 063606 (2012).
[12] We note that we do no consider here the quantum version of the two-mode approximation as discussed in G. J. Milburn, *et al.* Phys. Rev. A **55**, 4318 (1997), since the MCTDHB method enables us to go even beyond such approximated model.
[13] T. Caneva, T. Calarco, and S. Montangero, Phys. Rev. A **84**, 022326 (2011); P. Doria, T. Calarco, and S. Montangero, Phys. Rev. Lett. **106**, 190501 (2011).
[14] D. D'Alessandro, *Introduction to Quantum Control and Dynamics* (Chapman & Hall/CRC Applied Mathematics & Nonlinear Science, New York, 2008).
[15] A. Uhlmann, Rep. Math. Phys. **9** 273 (1976); C.A. Fuchs and C.M. Caves, Phys. Rev. Lett. 73, 3047(1994).
[16] T. Caneva *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **103**, 240501 (2009).
[17] M. Murphy, et.al., Phys. Rev. A **82**, 022318 (2010).
[18] M.M. Taddei *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **110**, 050402 (2013).
[19] A. del Campo *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **110**, 050403 (2013).
[20] J. Anandan and Y. Aharonov, Phys. Rev. Lett. **65**, 1697 (1990).
[21] For $U, \Delta U = 0$ we recover the pulse for the linear system $D(t) = 0$. Also we have assumed here control only on $D(t)$ but if also the other parameters are time-dependent $U(t), \Delta U(t)$, still the condition for the optimal protocol remains the same.
[22] T. Zibold, E. Nicklas, C. Gross, and M. K. Oberthaler, Phys. Rev. Lett. **105**, 204101 (2010)
[23] T. Berrada, S. van Frank, R. Bücker, T. Schumm, J.-F. Schaff, J. Schmiedmayer, Nature Communications **4**, 2077 (2013)
[24] I. Marino, S. Raghavan, S. Fantoni, S. R. Shenoy, and A. Smerzi, Phys. Rev. A **60**, 487 (1999)
[25] K. Sakmann *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **103**, 220601 (2009).
[26] M. Olshanii, Phys. Rev. Lett. **81**, 938 (1998).